

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 21, 26, and 28 have been amended, and claims 6, 7, 15, and 25 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-5, 8-14, 16-24, and 26-28 are pending in the present application.

A telephone interview was conducted with the undersigned and the Examiner, Walter F. Briney, III, on August 17, 18, and 19, 2004. The Applicants are appreciative of the Examiner granting the interview. The pending claims and the cited prior art references were discussed. The Examiner agreed that none of the cited references taught or disclosed at least the claimed feature of adjusting a step size of an integrator. The Applicants believe that the pending claims (to the extent they call for this claimed feature) are allowable for at least this and/or other reasons presented in this Response.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 10-12, 21-23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 5,636,273 (*Schopfer*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,583,934 (*Zhou*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The features of claims 6 and 7 have been incorporated into claim 1. The amended claim 1 calls for increasing a bandwidth by increasing a step size of an integrator. None of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination, teaches this claimed feature. Even if the accumulator 416 of *Zhou* is construed to be an integrator, *Zhou* does not teach increasing or adjusting the step size of the accumulator. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 10 is amended to include a similar feature of adjusting a step size of an integrator that is not taught or even suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, claim 10 and its dependent claims are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 13 has been rewritten to include the features previously recited in dependent claim 15. None of the cited references teaches adjusting a gain of the integrator. Additionally, none of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination, teaches adjusting the transient response time by adjusting a coefficient of a filter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Independent claim 21, as well as claims depending therefrom, is allowable for one or more of the reasons presented above. Claim 27 is allowable for at least the same reason claim 1 is allowable.

In light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-5, 8-14, 16-24, and 26-28 are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney hereby requests an interview with the Examiner to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 24, 2004

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

By: 

Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)